R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 100 CG 000 840

CHICAGO COPED ACTIVITIES--SOME COMMENTS ON STRUCTURE, FUNCTION AND THE HELPING RELATION.

BY- LIGHTHALL, FREDERICK F.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.32 31P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SCHOOL SYSTEMS, DECISION MAKING, *COMMUNICATION (THOUGHT TRANSFER), SOCIAL STRUCTURE, *CONSULTATION PROGRAMS, *PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, CHANGING ATTITUDES, SOCIAL CHANGE, *SCHOOL PLANNING, SCHOOL ROLE, COOP. PROJ. ON EDUC. DEVELOPMENT (COPED)

THE CHICAGO COOPERATIVE PROJECT IN EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (COPED), LIKE OTHER COPED CENTERS, WAS DESIGNED TO STUDY AND FACILITATE THE PROCESS OF PLANNED CHANGE IN SCHOOL SYSTEMS. THE PROJECT IS DESCRIBED AS "EMERGENT," SLOWLY EVOLVING WITH EACH ACTIVITY ALTERING ITS DEVELOPMENT. A DISTINCTION IS MADE BETWEEN PLANNING AND PREPARATION. COPED IS UNPLANNED BUT PREPARED. THAT IS, COPED RESPONDS IN CO-VARIATION WITH CLIENT RESPONSE. COPED'S PURPOSES INCLUDE--(1) THE TENDENCY TO SLOW UP THE DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN THEIR DISTRICT SO THAT PROBLEMS CAN BE THOROUGHLY EXPLORED, (2) TO INCREASE GENUINE DIALOGUE, (3) TO KEEP THE CLIENT IN THE GROWING ROLE, (4) TO BROADEN THE ROLE OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST AND OTHER TRAINED PERSONNEL, (5) TO PROVIDE MODELS OF THE DESIRED BEHAVIOR, AND (6) TO EXAMINE THE CONSTRUCTS STRUCTURING THE BEHAVIOR OF THE CLIENT SCHOOL DISTRICT. THE BEGINNINGS OF COPED IN CHICAGO AND ITS WORK ARE DISCUSSED. VARIOUS SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND THEIR FUNCTIONS ARE DESCRIBED AS THEY EMERGED. ATTENTION IS FOCUSED ON COLLECTIVE DELIBERATION, A FUNCTION WHICH EMERGED IN THE STEERING COMMITTEE. A HYPOTHESIS ABOUT THE NECESSITY OF COLLECTIVE DELIBERATION IS OFFERED. (SK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

~~DRAFT: Not for Quotation~~

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED014100

Chicago COPED[1] Activities: Some Comments on Structure, Function and the Helping Relation

Frederick P. Lighthall
University of Chicago

To describe the Chicago COPED relation with its school system requires a consideration of at least the following topics: source or purpose, social structure, functions, development, and effects. No consideration of these could possibly be adequate, however, that did not treat them in relation to their emergence over time. The source of each step in the project is a peculiar and, I want to emphasize, unpredictable and unplanned, function of the structures, functions, and effects of earlier steps in the project. That is to say, the purposes of the intervention are in important respects emergent.

To point to the emergent nature of the project is to speak of its development. The project's development has been unplanned in important and purposeful ways, and will continue to have this characteristic. But I want to pick up a distinction here that one of my associates in the project, Audrey Borth,

---

[1] The Cooperative Project in Educational Development (COPED) is an inter-university enterprise, with centers in Boston, Chicago Ann Arbor, and New York, designed to study and facilitate the process of planned change in school systems.

CG 000 840

has found useful. The distinction is between being planned and being prepared. To be unplanned is not to be haphazard or whimsical. Many of my colleagues in COPED apparently conceive the only alternative to a tightly designed study, for example, to be a study that is haphazard, unsystematic, and undisciplined. A view of inquiry that requires the inquirer to plan what data will be gathered and when, regardless of its relevance at the time and regardless of the effects of data-gathering operations on the course of the intervention is too narrow a definition of inquiry. A prepared inquirer will, on the contrary, monitor his design, his planning, and his inquiry as he proceeds. His criteria for decisions may be just as disciplined and just as consistently adhered to as the planned inquirer, but they will be conceived at a much more abstract level than are plans or designs. A comparison of an experimental psychologist in a Hullian or Skinnerian laboratory, on one hand, with a psychotherapist, on the other, may help to bring into relief the difference between being planned and being prepared. The designed or planned study of the laboratory is prepared up to the point of running the rats. That is, the scientist shifts his design in relation to unstated notions about good science, artful experimental manipulations, and the like, and finally, after much uncharted and unplanned but still well prepared shifting around, he comes up with a plan or a design. From that point on, his inquiry is planned, and can be (and frequently is) carried out by a relatively untrained assistant.

The therapist, on the other hand, is never quite in the position to carry out a planned study -- he tends to get caught in the pre-planning stage of inquiry where what he knows informs what he can look for and what he may test out with his patient, but where events in therapeutic sessions transpire much too rapidly for him to be planned for more than fleeting moments. What saves him, if he is saved at all, is not planning but preparation -- preparation for the classes of events he will be confronted with and for the characteristics by which he may know them when they do appear; preparation for recurring kinds of relation with his client; preparation for recurring kinds of emotion within himself.

Let's consider in greater detail the comparison between an experimentalist in the laboratory and a therapist in his consulting room. The experimentalist has planned his study and is now carrying out pre-scheduled procedures for obtaining responses that will be quantified into evidence that certain antecedent conditions cause, lead to, or are followed by certain consequences according to prediction. The experimentalist does not alter his procedures in the course of his study of his subjects. He does not respond to their responses with a shift in his experimental intervention. Why on earth would he do such a thing? His interest is in the data, not the subjects. They are working for him, not he for them.

In therapy the relation between the chief participants is different from the relation that obtains in the laboratory.

The therapist, even the experimentally oriented one, responds with his intervention in co-variation with his client's response. Or rather, the therapist's response is contingent upon his interpretation of the client's response. Does this make the therapist's interventions whimsical and unsystematic? Certainly not. There is a pattern of contingency there, as anyone who watches a motion picture of Carl Rogers in a client-centered session can attest. And yet the intervention is not planned in the way the experimentalist's is in the laboratory. Why on earth would it be? The therapist's interest is not in data that might be produced by some constant stimulus or even some constant and irreversable contingency. His interest is in the client, and the contract is for the therapist to work for the client, not the other way around.

The consequence of this kind of contract is that the client can and does have the power to change the intervention whether or not he is aware of that power. This power is the source of problems when an investigator assumes a data-centered attitude toward a consultant-client relationship. I hasten to add that the problem this power poses is not insurmountable, but one must at least recognize and deal with the problem.

On the one hand the consultant wants to help the client. On the other hand he wants to study the process of helping. If he assumes the attitude of the laboratory experimentalist in his inquiry he is led to set up a particular set of conditions or contingencies with regard to a limited number of

variables, and to run his clients through these conditions or contingencies without shifting them. On the other hand, if he is dealing with human clients, he is likely to be presented repeatedly with variations in client behavior -- responses that indicate emergent priorities or sudden spurts of growth -- that were quite unanticipated, that bear directly on the client-consultant relation, and that require the devising of unanticipated moves if the relation is to continue or to continue to be helpful. And I want to emphasize that I am not including in these unanticipated client responses those which are merely manipulative; such manipulative attempts on the part of the client will, if allowed to become the basis for the consultant's accommodating shifts, nullify the help even if they prolong the relationship. In considering only non-manipulative client behaviors that emerge unexpectedly, what does the data-oriented consultant do? Does he shift his plan and thereby alter irreversably the quality of his intervention, or does he stick to his plan and jeopardize the help that his relation with the client might eventually bring to the client? There is no getting around the conflict of purpose here. If the consultant wishes to study a helping relation over time, he has to develop a relation with a client that is one that helps. If, on the other hand, he simply wants to study variables associated with client-consultant relations irrespective of their helping quality, then he has no conflict and will not hesitate to stick to

his plan in the face of a presumed decrement in its assistance to the client.

Certain other conditions might also effect the data-oriented consultant's decision. Suppose, for example, that the data-oriented consultant wants to study the emergence of a genuinely helping relation and has instrumentation and well-defined criteria for assessing help, but only has a very limited number of possible clients. He would then assume a different stance toward the discontinuation of a relation than if he had clients banging on the door and sufficient time to engage them.

In the COPED situation we have neither many clients nor great ease of establishing relations with them. Our decisions about holding to a planned design or altering it are conditioned by such constraints. But our commitments to data and design, as distinct from commitments to the client, hold still another problem in COPED. Even if we conceive of our intervention as one that may vary according to emergent client conditions, we may, in our commitment to data, insist that certain kinds of data be gathered at certain planned junctures in the relation and that these data-gathering commitments, at least, must remain inviolable. This certainly sounds reasonable; how else could any data be gathered if not by some planned schedule?

Unfortunately, this commitment, too, may run afoul of the requirements of a helping relation. Much depends on the nature of the data and of the procedures, of course. In COPED the major source of common data is a rather extensive

questionnaire. It consumes the better part of two hours for most adults and nearly the same for the children. If a demand for such time is seen as an arbitrary imposition from above in a school district, and if one of the major purposes of a helping intervention in the district is to develop a norm counter to arbitrariness and imposition, a norm of participation and shared problem solving, then to introduce such a massive data collection without its being clearly instrumental to some shared goal or problem solution as seen by those who will respond to the questionnaire is to violate the purpose for being in the district in the first place. And so, given a commitment to facilitate such values, it is clearly necessary to take steps that will guarantee that the CORED instrument package will be instrumental to the purposes and problems of the district. Such a presumption, of course, is Machiavellian; to intend to come out on the other side of an intervention simply where we want to be is clearly to intend mere manipulation on our part.

On the other hand, without some prior agreement about data, how shall we collect any evidence that reflects our own purposes for inquiry or that allows cross-center comparisons? Clearly we must agree to some instrumentation. But does it have to be inviolate? Let us put the matter this way: to the extent that we can negotiate with our districts a data-gathering procedure that does no violence to our relation with it, we shall do so. This recognizes the client power that I

mentioned before: the client must retain this power. It is this power of choice, in fact, that we want to enlarge and leave more robust after we leave the district than when we entered. As one of our Steering Committee members put it: "You would never be allowed to come into the district now in the way that you did enter, and we're glad you came"! Her sentiments are not yet universal in the district, on either point.

Our inquiry in our school district is to some extent prepared, and one of our aims is to become increasingly prepared. Our inquiry is, however, relatively unplanned. The reasons why planning must give way to preparation may become clear as this narrative proceeds.

Our purposes are not easily stated. Quite aside from the fact that each of us in the Chicago consultant group has his own purposes in addition to those he may share with others, those purposes that we share are not completely described by any existing theory or frame of reference. I think, for example, that we all probably share the purpose of developing and reinforcing in our client district the tendency to slow up the decision-making process so that problems can be thoroughly explored before solutions are sought. This is essentially what N.R.F. Maier has been referring to for many years as the problem-oriented, as distinct from the solution-oriented process of problem-solving in groups. And so we might say that we are after

in our district what Maier is after in his industrial settings.

But to say that is insufficient to describe our purpose. We could also say, for example, that we want more emphasis on what messages are received and how they are decoded and less emphasis on what messages are sent and on their encoding. That is, instead of (or perhaps in addition to) much effort going into the wording of a memorandum from the superintendent's or principal's office and little or no effort into finding out what information is internalized by the readers of the memorandum, we should like a greater percentage of time and effort devoted by the senders of messages to what is understood and internalized by the receivers of messages. We would intend "message" to denote both spoken and written communications, of course.

Another purpose, then, can be stated in the language of communication; and this language employs terms quite different from the language of Maier in discussing problem solving. But the language of communication, too, is insufficient to encompass our shared purpose. We have to have recourse to the language of Buber, for example, who speaks of the life of dialogue and monologue and the worlds of I-Thou and I-It. To increase the incidence of genuine dialogue is a shared purpose: a shared purpose quite unstatable in terms of communication theory or in Maier's problem-solving framework. We have to have recourse, also, to the language Rogers uses when he describes the necessity of allowing the client to be. An important component

of Rogers' thinking is the assumption that the client has magnificent growth potential within himself, even when he seems completely stultified and hemmed in by his own behavior and desires. Thus Rogers' language provides a way to describe one of our purposes: to keep ourselves in the helping role and our client in the growing role and to keep as our highest priority the emergent powers of the client, subordinated to our own conceptions of how organizations have been found to behave in other studies or what it would be good for the client to know at this point or that point. This is not a denial of an active, intrusive role on our part, however; rather, it makes our expression at every point contingent on the emergent powers of the client. Sometimes the client will fairly cry out for intrusion on our part -- not a dependent cry for mothering, not an escape from freedom, but an adaptive plea for another's point of view to break out of an unwanted parochialism. We will respond to this kind of cry in various ways that we suppose are relevant to an expansion of client powers. When we do we will try to be conscious of our purpose, stated earlier in communication terms, of finding out what message was actually received, what the actual effects of our intrusion have been.

Another purpose, drawing on the concepts of role and social organization, is to broaden the role of the school psychologist and other psychologically trained personnel in the district. We want to help the district develop indigenous,

and profesionally catholic roles for psychological specialists and to move away from the encapsulated, professionally parochial roles imported from other institutions like child guidance clinics.

Still another frame of reference, psychoanalysis, provides a term needed to extend these statements of purpose -- ego ideal. One of the most important conceptions to which we repair again and again is the conception that what we do we are instructing; how we act provides an immediate, tangible image of behavior untransformed by the words we may use. One aspect of our purpose, then, is to model the kinds of behavior we want to leave behind us when we leave.

As a final example, our current conception of our purpose cannot be stated fully without using the language of personal constructs and of constructive alternativism provided by George Kelly. The network of constructs that structures client behavior is an important focus of our purpose; such networks must become conscious, examined, and aligned with values held by the client. But the network of constructs that structure our behavior as consultants must also become conscious and we must be as active in aligning our constructs with our values as we hope our clients will be. Our conception of ego ideal demands this, but so does our conception of dialogue. Each frame of reference contributes a part to the statement of our purpose.

One of the characteristics of our purpose evidenced in even the gross attempt I have just made to state it is that each of its parts impinges on others. This means that when we

become clearer on or expand one of these parts the whole conception shifts. Our purpose is emergent in the same sense as the project as a whole is emergent.

I entered the District on the basis of professional concerns about school psychology shared by the Superintendent. The initial social structure of entry, then, was an attraction between a power figure in the client system and one in a still to be formed consultant system (COPED) that was based on mutually held concerns about a particular kind of role in school systems generally. This social structure was small and its purpose was focused and limited. As consultative activity proceeded in the District, both structures and functions expanded and became differentiated. Some structures were fleeting while others seem to have become relatively permanent. Representative social structures are presented in Figure 1 in the sequence in which they were created in the District.

The initial structure endured long enough to shift its purpose from a focus on a particular role to a focus on a new curriculum project in sex education that had been developing in the district. That project never became the actual focus of consultation. Events forged a substitution. A choice of subject matters was offered the consultant by the Superintendent; he was to select from a number of different areas one of interest to him that would become clear to him from a day's activities in the district. In a brief one-day survey, through

the consultant's participation in the Administrative Cabinet and through interviews of teaching teams and of individual teachers and administrators, the consultant was to select an area of work in the system that he thought his skills might facilitate. The consultant, in turn, offered his own substitute: an opportunity for the District to work with a team of consultants, namely COPED, rather than an opportunity for the Superintendent to work with the consultant on a one-to-one basis. In addition, accompanying the substitute offer were two $1,200 five-week summer traineeships in educational consultation for District staff members. The Superintendent facilitated the entry of COPED by holding another meeting of the Administrative Cabinet with the consultant for the purpose of exploring a by now much modified purpose: the facilitation of work in groups. Two of the five principals in the District were named to receive the traineeships.

Thus from a rather limited purpose, exploring a concern over a particular school role, with a limited social structure, a one-to-one relation between a consultant and a client, the client consultant relation emerged with a very broad purpose, improvement of work in groups, with a much more complicated structure, a group-to-group relation between a team of consultants and an on-going administrative committee, the Administrative Cabinet. The two principals chosen to receive residential training in educational consultation were members of this 7-man Administrative Cabinet.

The Superintendent asked for a formal proposal about COPED activities in the District that he could take before the Board of Education. And so the social structures implicated in the relation expanded further. The proposal, in essence, offered the District the same option that its Superintendent had offered this consultant earlier, namely, a choice of goals that it might choose to have COPED work on with groups in the District. The Superintendent failed to obtain approval of the proposed COPED activities from the Board of Education, prolonging the life of the project in the District only by interpreting COPED activities with the Board as coming under his jurisdiction as administrator according to powers already granted to him by the Board. These events transpired after the summer training of the two principals.

With this rather inauspicious beginning, a first COPED intervention was launched in the District itself. An ad hoc group of teachers and administrators was convened, including the Administrative Cabinet and a teacher from each of the five building advisory committees, to begin sensing changes needed in the District. The intended method called for members of the group to respond to five open-ended questions on changes, a sub-group tabulation of these responses, and a discussion about the responses that would be fed back to the group by the tabulators.

Instead, questions about COPED and the task occupied the group, along with a brief report from the Superintendent

about the fate of the proposal. Before the second meeting, responses to the five change questions were written, reproduced, and circulated, and everyone read the original proposal. A second meeting worked as a whole and in small groups to find themes in the responses to the questions on change in the District. After a number of themes were identified, we turned to questions of structure again: (1) who else in the District was needed in the group to identify and work on problems in the District? and (2) from this large, representative group how could we go about establishing a smaller steering committee that would guide all COPED activities in the District? On these questions the group foundered: silence, boredom, embarrassment, and confusion about purpose and about the future of the group were apparent, and were expressed on post-meeting reaction sheets. A review of the meeting afterwards by consultants (we were now two) and various members of the ad hoc group produced the conclusions that (1) we needed broader representation from the District (2) this group was unable to provide that broader representation because it had no legitimate power in the District and because its relation to the existing committee structure was completely unclear; (3) no steering committee could be created from this group, since it lacked representativeness and legitimation; and
(4) there already was a completely representative body in the District -- the District General Council -- of which almost all of the persons attending the ad hoc meetings were members:

(5) the present, ad hoc, committee should be discontinued and its purposes pursued with the District General Council; and (6) a third and final meeting of the ad hoc group should be held to (a) announce its demise, (b) review events so far in the District and project future activities with the District General Council, and (c) enlist this ad hoc group's help in avoiding repetition of earlier mistakes and inclusion of activities that they saw as definitely being needed.

And so another phase in the project's involvement with social structures ended, and one began. A single meeting with the District General Council -- a large committee whose representation extends to both certified and non-certified personnel -- led to the naming of six persons who would become, with the two COPED members, the Steering Committee. The six were named on the basis of interest and variation in role and level of involvement in the system. We wanted teachers, principals, and district-wide administrators represented in the Steering Committee.

Ten Steering Committee meetings have now been held; they last two hours and occur regularly every two weeks. The task of the Committee has been to make recommendations to the District through the District General Council as to where COPED activities ought to concentrate in the District. There have been no additional structural changes beyond the Steering Committee. As we now shift to consider our functions in the District, it will be clear that additional structural changes

are imminent.

Early functions served by the consulting relation were contact with a university, experimentation with a new kind of consultation (review of several District activities), and staff development through the traineeships. Early functions served by the client relation were contact with an unusually receptive and stimulating Superintendent and experimentation with a new kind of consultation. As the consultant-client relation proceeded through the proposal, the three ad hoc meetings, the District General Council, and the Steering Committee, functions became more differentiated. The functions that the Steering Committee has served to date have been internal to the Steering Committee rather than in its relation to the rest of the District through the District General Council.

The consultants have had an opportunity to watch the tortuous emergence of a consensual diagnosis of a single, over-arching problem that permeates the District and the somewhat less tortuous identification of the categories of people in the District that should be involved in any solution of that problem. The consultants, being relative novices, have also observed themselves self-consciously over these ten meetings. One thing has been apparent over and over again to all of us in the Steering Committee. We have observed and voiced awareness that the three levels of experience and professional responsibility represented by the Associate Superintendent, the three principals, and

the two teachers, have broadened in definite and consistent ways the concepts of problem and solution that we have finally arrived at. Quite consistently the administrators in the group have been sensitive to the gaps in teachers' conceptions of the total system and in teachers' skills in working with groups; just as consistently the teachers in the group have been sensitive to the narrow conception held by administrators regarding how information is conveyed, and how the dichotomy between planning and implementing can lead to frustration if the planners are superordinates and the implementers are subordinates. In our proposals for how we should tackle the problem that we had worked so hard to formulate and had finally agreed on, the teachers, for example, saw a great need for administrators to have intensive training in T groups while the administrators saw the necessity for workshop-like activities for teachers.

One of the functions the Steering Committee has served, then, is the function of making manifestly apparent to the two major professional levels in the group that they have favorite solutions and favorite problem formulations that are each quite insufficient. The term 'manifestly apparent' must be qualified, however. The tendency for teachers, quite unwittingly, to propose solutions that require change in administrators' behavior and the equally ready tendency of administrators, equally unwittingly, to call for teacher modification as the solution has been acted out and verbally labeled in the group, much to the amusement of all. The phenomenon is thus manifestly apparent on our tape

recordings. It is there is hard data. But the extent to which its manifestness has led to a change in behavior tendency is still quite open to question. We shall have made significant progress toward genuine dialogue or what Buber calls "experiencing the other side" when members of each group check themselves in this apparent parochiality.

So far the presence of both groups has functioned as a sort of natural power balance to mitigate the one-sidedness that would clearly prevail were only one or the other group present. The much more significant function of internalizing the other's point of view is yet to be in evidence.

Another function served by the Steering Committee is a sort of half-way house or protected but real situation in which the interpersonal skills to which the two principals were exposed in their residential training may be practiced by them. In this regard it is a continued training experience for them in the context of their on-going work. But it is also, of course, a training experience in the same sense for the others in the group. Thus training, of the modeling rather than the didactic kind, is one function of the Steering Committee.

There is some evidence, through our observations of a District General Council meeting and a tape recording of an Administrative Cabinet meeting, that some aspects of the training can quite naturally spill over into the on-going life of the school The evidence regarding the effects of COPED activities in the District is minimal at this point, however. We can see evidence

in group behavior outside the Steering Committee of testing for commitment, of summarizing, of clarifying, of questioning an apparent consensus, and of keeping discussion open long enough to obtain extended consideration of an unpopular point of view. There is evidence of this on the tape of a recent Administrative Cabinet.[1] What we do not know is whether this quality of discussion existed before special training and the supporting Steering Committee meetings. Some spontaneous comments have been heard (and recorded) in Steering Committee meetings about the fact that no vote has been taken in Cabinet meetings for several months, and the like, but we must push inquiry into the history of these behaviors further. Interviews conducted with non-COPED participants in the Cabinet regarding passages of the tape should provide helpful data on this point.

Another function of the Steering Committee, of course, relates to its first and continuing charge: to plan for and guide COPED activities in the District. The Steering Committee has not been a T-group; it has had a task function from the beginning. We have confronted process issues directly as they were instrumental to improving work flow, not as ends in themselves or as activities undertaken apart from the Steering Committee's task. In the course of planning, the Committee has explored some of the favorite

---

[1] The Cabinet itself has not been the scene of any COPED interventions directly.

techniques of group dynamicists with some considerable excitement. After identifying the over-arching problem of the District and providing various examples at several levels of the system, it became clear that we had to get back to the District with a communication that would excite interest in educational activities.

How does a group that has come some distance in its thinking about what should happen in the District come back to the District with a communication that will not destroy its intention by being arrogant and dictatorial or boring or simply confusing? As usual a number of alternatives were suggested, including the time honored administrative technique of having a presentation that would describe COPED activities. That could be benign, if boring, but how could it invite excitement and participation? There was universal agreement that whatever we did we should not make the same mistake as other institute activities where the teachers always brought knitting and no one ever missed a stitch!

Our solution was an adaptation of two techniques known to Bethel types: the fishbowl and the empty chair. We would hold a regular Steering Committee meeting, in the round, with the entire faculty of the District. The issues that would come up would be precisely the issues that each Steering Committee member wanted to bring up, as usual, and they would undoubtedly include all of the concerns that each of us had expressed about developing commitment from District members, making in-service training meaningful rather than simply a professional obligation, what the major and recurring problem of the District was, anyway, and

finally, why the administration of the COPED core instrument package had generated so much hostility. Two empty chairs would allow participation from the audience. They might not be filled. Then that, too, would be grist for the mill.

One function of the Steering Committee, then, was to encourage thinking about how to communicate with others about the plans you have for them. The administrators are accustomed to this problem, but I dare say, our solution is not wholly familiar to them. They, like the rest of us, are scared to death at the prospect of an open meeting where District issues will be confronted directly.

Our ninth Steering Committee meeting was one of the most novel of our meetings, in my estimation. There were no fireworks or anything overtly dramatic, but there was an unusual kind of synthesis of two kinds of COPED work in the District that had been separate up to that point. It was a special meeting, called at the request of our Research Director and Historian. At this meeting we were to negotiate with the District, through the Steering Committee, a second administration of the long questionnaire that had caused widespread aggrevation at the first poorly prepared, administration.

We wanted to ensure an apparent connection, as well as a real connection, between our data-gathering efforts and our interventions, but we were committed to going the way the Steering Committee decided, regardless of our desire to assess our effects in the District. The research team as well as the intervention team attended. After stating our own preferences

the District members explored their pros and cons and, after pushing the limits of possibilities, from not giving the instrument at all to just giving it all again in the same way, came to a tested consensus that (1) all but one part of the instrument would be administered to (2) a sample reduced slightly in numbers and in kinds of role, (3) after the two initial workshop with our "target population" which (4) in turn, would have been prepared through (a) a District-wide fishbowl meeting and (b) faculty meetings attended by members of the Steering Committ

Our negotiations, at first seen as simply a necessary and consistent approach to the District, appear in retrospect to have produced a solution to the data-gathering problem that is far more satisfying to the very principles that underlie our approach than we could ourselves imagine. We, the consultants, received clear and substantial help from them, the clients, in our data-gathering problem. That, for me, constitutes strong reinforcement of the idea of negotiated inquiry.

I used the phrase, 'the need for reflection,' in the original title of this paper. The phrase attests an awareness that has grown in the course of observations in the district during the past year that an important function is either altogether missing or is present in only a weak and sporadic form in this, and probably other, school systems. The function that appears to be missing is collective deliberation about ends and about problems.

There seems to be individual deliberation about problems and about ends. Most teachers and administrators are quite articulate about what they want and, given a trusting relationship between them and an interviewer, they are also articulate about problems. Collective decision making also is clearly in evidence in this District. One can point to instances where it could be argued that more collective and less individual decision making is called for, but there is, nevertheless, unmistakable evidence of not only collective decision making but also stabilized means whereby decisions shall be, and are, forged from various points of view in the District. The Administrative Cabinet, for example, is a structu that quite naturally, because of its composition, performs this function.

But individual deliberation or collective decision making do not constitute collective deliberation. Perhaps a new term is needed to label the distinctive functions I have in mind, but I prefer not to clutter up the language further. Rather, let me describe the function that I refer to by 'collective deliberation.'

I have already noted that the term refers to functions that are different from collective decision making. It is true that a kind of deliberation goes along with the kind of collective decision making that the Administrative Cabinet, for example, engages in. But that kind of deliberation appears to be almost completely in the service of problems already

sensed or goals already identified by individuals. Collective deliberation can be distinguished from collective decision making by precisely these characteristics: is the function of the group's work to solve problems or achieve given ends or is it to identify problems or identify and set in order of priority the ends to be strived for?

The ever-riding impression that recurs in working with the Steering Committee is that the kind of discursive, crisis-free deliberation that characterizes its meetings has not been in evidence before in this District. And yet it is quite plain to us that the problem we have identified as thematic in the operation of the District could only have been identified and clarified through the many hours of Steering Committee time spent in building trust with other group members, in struggling to defend one's own frame of reference and terms, in accommodating both frames of reference and terms to a common language and set of concepts, in exploring false leads and in recognizing recurrent themes.

To what extent collective deliberation is a function that is crucial to planned change or is useful to the smooth running of the District is a matter for continued observation. My hypothesis is that no collectively enhancing or collectively satisfying changes can be undertaken without collective deliberation.

I have explored briefly several aspects of our negotiated inquiry in the District. The meaning of the distinction between being planned and being prepared was considered in relation to interventions of the kind we are carrying out with the District. In the course of that discussion I hope what is meant by 'negotiated inquiry' was clarified. I then turned to our purpose; they are emergent both in actuality and in our awarene To a considerable extent it is true that we come to understand our intervention purposes as we come to understand a dream: we do it first, in response to immediately impinging events and guided by conceptions beyond awareness, and later come to understand it only after retrospective analysis. Discussion of purpose was followed by a narrative describing work in the District. Various social structures and some of their functions were described as they emerged in sequence. Finally, attention was given to a function that appears to have emerged in the Steering Committee and that apparently has not been in evidence before in the District: collective deliberation. The distinction between collective decision making and collecti deliberation was described and a hypothesis was offered regardi the necessity of collective deliberation.

	Consultant	Subject Matter	Client	Date
1.	C1	criticize narrow role of school psychologists: no institutional research	S	early Spring, '65
2.	C1	explore field training possibilities for school psychologists	S R	late Spring, '65
3.	C1	off-site training: 2-wk education laboratory, Bethel		Summer, '65
4.	C1	critical review of District plans for implementing a sex education program	S R Ss Sx	Winter, '66
5.	C1	over-view of some system problems and possible areas of consultation	Pi Adm. Cab. Tchng. Tm.	3/16/66
6.	C1	explore COPED possibilities in District; identify two training consultants (TC)	Adm. Cab.	5/17/66
7.	C1	written COPED proposal conveyed to Board; neither approved nor rejected: tabled	S Bd. of Educ.	6/23/66

Fig. 1. Sequence of social structures and subject matter of Chicago COPED transactions with District 68.

	Consultant	Subject Matter	Client	Date
8.	C2	off-site training: Group Relations Conference, Mt. Holyoke; 2 weeks		6/10-24/66
9.	C1	off-site training: Community and Training Consultants' Laboratory, Bethel	P_1 Adm. Cab. P_2	7/1-8/7/66
		5 weeks for TC's; 2 weeks with C1 as co-trainee		
10.	C1	mtg.#1 of ad hoc cross-role group: respond to "Changes", reproduce and feed back responses; members read proposal	S AS TC1 TC2 ad hoc (includes Adm. Cab.)	9/21/66
11.	C1 C2	plan ad hoc mtg. # 2		9/26/66 10/3/66
12.	C1 C2	mtg.#2 of ad hoc group: find themes in "Changes" responses; try, and fail, to move toward forming a steering committee	S AS TC1 TC2 ad hoc	10/4/66
13.	C1 C2	post mortem of mtg.#2: why no movement toward st. comm.; why negative part?	S TC1 AS	10/4/66

Fig. 1. (continued)

	Consultant	Subject Matter	Client	Date
14.	C1, C2	plan ad hoc mtg. # 3: prepare written summary of events so far and of par's on #2 for ad hoc members		10/10/66
15.	R1, R2	separate interviews with each of the 5 principals: data gathering time and procedures		10/10/66
16.	R1	superintendent interview: interview schedule from core instrument package	S	10/17/66
17.	C1, C2	mtg. #3: kill ad hoc group after presenting diagnosis; get advice for next steps	ad hoc	10/18/66
18.	C1, C2, H	first mtg. of District General Council with COPED: establish Steering Committee	DGC (includes Ad. Cab.)	10/25/66
19.	C2	30 interviews and observations spread over District with adm.s, tchrs, and specialists		10/19-28/66
20.	C1	separate interviews with each principal: where should COPED effort be concentrated?		11/1/66
21.	C1, R1, H, C2, R2	first staff meeting of Chicago COPED; Monday mornings thereafter		11/2/66
22.	C1, C2, H	1st Steering Committee (SC) mtg.: membership questions and enumeration of District's problems		11/3/66

Fig. 1. (continued)

	Consultant	Subject Matter	Client	Date
23.	(C1)	arrange core package and pmr's for fifth-grade children; school SC	P3	11/7/66
24.	(C2)	interview of each Steering Committee member; observation of a tchng. tm. mtg.	AS, TC1, TC2, T1, T2, P3	11/8/66
25.	(C1), (C2), H, R1, R2	2nd COP&D staff mtg.: confidentiality of logs; preparation for nat'l COP&D mtg.		11/9/66
26.	(R)	arrange core package and pmr's for fifth-grade children: school JS	TC2	11/9/66
27.	(R1)	arrange core package and pmr's for fifth-grade children: school H	P4	11/9/66
28.	(R1)	arrange core package and pmr's for fifth-grade children: school D	P5	11/9/66
29.	(C1), (C2)	discuss SC mtg. #1 and plan for #2.		11/10/66
30.	(C1), (C2)	SC mtg. #2: confidentiality of SC discussions; relation of SC to DGC; role of COP&D consultants in SC.	TC1, TC2, P3, AS, T2, T1	11/10/66

Fig. 1. (continued)

Glossary of Abbrebiations Used in Figure 1

AS - Associate Superintendent

BM - Business Manager

C1, C2 - First and second consultants, who are concerned with intervention

H - Historian on the consultant team

I - Administrative intern

P1,P2,P3 - Principals in the District

R - Research Director in the District

R1, R2 - Two research persons on the consultant team

S - Superintendent

T1, T2 - Two teachers

TC1, TC2 - Two principals (P1 and P2) who had received special training in consultation

Broken lines encircling consultant indicate involvement of persons, who were later to become consultants, before they had entered a consultant-client relationship.